

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/823,920	04/14/2004	Imtiaz Rangwalla	05716.0013-00000	6117	
	7590 12/21/2004 IENDERSON, FARAB	EXAMINER			
LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			SHEWAREGED, BETELHEM		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	., 20 200012		1774		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			12/21/2006	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/823,920	RANGWALLA, IMTIAZ		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Betelhem Shewareged	1774		

		Betelhem Shewareged	1774	
The MAILING DATE of this	communication appear	ars on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence	address
THE REPLY FILED 27 November 2006	• •		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rej this application, applicant must tin places the application in condition a Request for Continued Examina time periods:	ection, but prior to or on nely file one of the follow n for allowance; (2) a Not	the same day as filing a N ving replies: (1) an amendr tice of Appeal (with appeal	otice of Appeal. To avoi nent, affidavit, or other e fee) in compliance with	d abandonment of evidence, which 37 CFR 41.31; or (3)
<ul> <li>a)  The period for reply expires 3 mo</li> <li>b)  The period for reply expires on: (* no event, however, will the statute</li> </ul>	1) the mailing date of this A	dvisory Action, or (2) the date		
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL F	ed, check either box (a) or ( REJECTION. See MPEP 70	b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) W 06.07(f).	HEN THE FIRST REPLY W	VAS FILED WITHIN
Extensions of time may be obtained under 3 have been filed is the date for purposes of dounder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply may reduce any earned patent term adjustm NOTICE OF APPEAL	etermining the period of ext the expiration date of the s received by the Office later	ension and the corresponding hortened statutory period for r than three months after the m	amount of the fee. The appending the firms and appending the firms are t	propriate extension fee al Office action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFI a Notice of Appeal has been filed,</li> </ol>	R 41.37(a)), or any exter	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.3	7(e)), to avoid dismissal	of the appeal. Since
AMENDMENTS				
3. The proposed amendment(s) file				red because
<ul><li>(a) ☐ They raise new issues that v</li><li>(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new</li></ul>			see NOTE below);	
(c) They are not deemed to place appeal; and/or	ce the application in bett	ter form for appeal by mate		ying the issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional clain NOTE: (See 37 CF	_	corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.	
<ol><li>The amendments are not in comp</li></ol>	oliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of	Non-Compliant Amenda	nent (PTOL-324).
5. 🔲 Applicant's reply has overcome t				
6. Newly proposed or amended clai non-allowable claim(s).				•
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposes of appeal, the proposes of amended claims with the status of the claim(s) is (or with Claim(s) allowed:	vould be rejected is prov		)	an explanation of
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-13,15-26 and</u> Claim(s) withdrawn from considera	<u>38-43</u> .			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	20011. <u>27-07</u> .			
3. The affidavit or other evidence file because applicant failed to provide was not earlier presented. See 37	e a showing of good and	before or on the date of fill sufficient reasons why the	ling a Notice of Appeal v e affidavit or other evider	vill <u>not</u> be entered nce is necessary and
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence file entered because the affidavit or of showing a good and sufficient rea</li> </ol>	d after the date of filing a	vercome all rejections und	er appeal and/or appella	int fails to provide a
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OF</li> </ol>		of the status of the claims	after entry is below or a	attached.
11.  The request for reconsideration been Continuation Sheet.		does NOT place the appli	cation in condition for al	lowance because:
12. Note the attached Information Di	sclosure Statement(s). (	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).	<u> </u>	
13.  Other:				
		-		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Rangwalla teaches a substrate and a lacquer substantially identical to the claimed substrate and lacquer, respectively. Rangwalla further teaches that an ink print layer provided between the substrate and the lacquer (see paragraphs 4-7 of Office Action mailed on 08/25/2006). Even though Rangwalla does not teach the use of electron beam curable ink composition selected from acrylate esters, vinyl ethers, cycloaliphatic diepoxides, and polyols; Rangwalla teaches the use of electron beam curable ink composition. In addition, Pennaz teaches the use of electron beam curable ink composition selected from acrylate esters, vinyl ethers, glycol and compound listed in col. 20, lines 1-43). The ink composition of Pennaz is provided on a paper or other print substrate (col. 1, line 65 thru col. 2, line 3). The motivation for combining Rangwalla and Pennaz is the need for the use of electron beam curable ink composition to be applied on a layered material. Neither Rangwalla nor Pennaz expressly disclose that the ink does not bond with lacquer, and since both the ink and the lacquer are cured by the same method of curing, the ink would bonds with the lacquer. Applicant is advised to provide factual evidence showing that there is no bonding between the ink and the lacquer. The test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981). The examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See in re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and In re Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

> BETELHEM SHRWAREGED PRIMARY EXAMINER